


Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		16356.823 (DC-05254)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on <u>October 12, 2007</u> Signature <u><i>S. C. Lien</i></u> Typed or printed name <u>Susan C. Lien</u>	Application Number		Filed
	10/675,396		September 30, 2003
	First Named Inventor		
	Kwatra, Ajay		
		Art Unit	Examiner
		2111	Daley, Christopher Anthony
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the			
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.		Signature	
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)		James R. Bell	
		Typed or printed name	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>26,528</u>		512.867.8407	
		Telephone number	
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		<u>10-11-07</u>	
		Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			

☒ *Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	§	
Kwatra, Ajay	§	
	§	Confirmation No.: 6485
Serial No. 10/675,396	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: 2111
Filed: September 30, 2003	§	
	§	Examiner: Daley, Christopher Anthony.
For: CHASSIS EXPANSION USING	§	
NEWCARD	§	

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Responsive to the Final Office Action, dated September 14, 2007 please consider the following remarks in connection with the pre-appeal brief request for review. Review of the final rejection is requested for the following reasons.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14 and 16-22 is not supported by a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 1, 4, 6-11 14, and 16-22.

Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14 and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sleeman (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0260843) (Sleeman) in view of Saunders (Newcard Exposed) (Saunders), and in further view of Ahern (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,214) (Ahern).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is missing at least because there is no support for an obviousness rejection of the claimed subject matter as a whole because the combination of Sleeman, Saunders, and Ahern fail to disclose each element of the claims or to suggest the missing elements.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner argues, in part:

"Sleeman as modified by Saunders does not explicitly disclose a power adapter connected to provide power to the second subsystem including the user console, whereby the power adapter is operable to receive an AC power input to be converted to various voltages as required by the user console, and the second subsystem deriving power from the computer via a powerline of the newcard device.

However, Ahren teaches [this]... Ahren teaches in Figure 6 of a laptop that comprises an ASIC that is coupled to connector 141, and 143 to derive power to subsystems, Col. 9, lines 35-47. In addition, Ahren teaches in Figure 3 of docking station comprising a console 90 and a power adapter 120. AC input supplies power to the docking station and power supply 120 produces the voltages for the various components of the system, COL. 8, lines 13-67."

Applicant respectfully disagrees to the Examiner's interpretation of Ahren as providing the claimed power means. Specifically, independent claim 1 requires in part: "power means including a power adapter connected to provide power to the second subsystem...and the second subsystem deriving power from the computer via a powerline of the Newcard device." The Applicant submits that Ahren at least does not disclose a "second subsystem deriving power from the computer via a powerline of the Newcard device" as required by claim 1. As admitted by the Examiner, Sleeman and Saunders fail to cure this deficiency.

Ahren does disclose a "power supply 120" which supplies voltages used to "power various components." Col 8, lines 66-67. The power supply 120 is included in the docking station. See Fig. 3. Ahren also discloses "[i]n some embodiments, one of these supply lines can be connected directly to the portable computer to charge its battery." Col. 8, line 67 – Col. 9 line 2. Supplying a voltage using the power supply 120 is clearly different than a subsystem deriving power through a powerline of a Newcard device as required by claim 1. The Applicant finds no disclosure of supplying power via a powerline of a Newcard device to a computer, docking station, or any subsystem in the cited portions of Ahren.

The Examiner argues that Ahren teaches in Fig. 6 of a laptop "an ASIC that is coupled to connector 141, and 143 to derive power to subsystems, Col 9, lines 35-47." Fig. 6 provides a "modified portable computer 126'... [that] contains...ASIC 56." Col. 9, lines 36-39. "[C]onnectors 141 and 143 carry various power management signals, and other signals associated with a docking system." Col. 9, lines 45-47, emphasis added. The ASIC 56 may be included in a package (116) having an outline complying with the PCMCIA standard. Col. 8, lines 57-60. Even assuming arguendo that the ASIC 56 discloses a Newcard device and that the signals carried by connectors 141 and 143 are supplied through the ASIC 56, the Applicant finds no mention in the cited portions of Ahren a disclosure of a subsystem deriving power from a computer through the ASIC 56. Carrying signals, including power management signals, is clearly different from deriving power from the computer via a powerline of the Newcard device.

Similarly, independent claims 11 and 21 recite, among other elements, "providing power means including a power adapter connected to provide power to the second subsystem...and the second subsystem deriving power from the computer via a powerline of the Newcard

device." As explained above, neither Sleeman, Saunders, nor Ahren teach or suggest providing power to a second subsystem including a power adapter connected to provide power and the second subsystem deriving power from a computer via a powerline of the Newcard device. Therefore, the rejections of these claims are also defective and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 1, 4, 6-10, 14, 16-20 and 22 depend from and further limit claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively and are also deemed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reason. See MPEP 2143.03.

Other reasons for the patentability of claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14 and 16-22 exist, including those previously presented and will be maintained should the filing of an appeal brief become necessary.

In conclusion, as discussed above, the cited references at least do not provide for power means including a power adapter providing power to a subsystem in addition to the subsystem deriving power from a computer via a powerline of a Newcard device. As a result, the Examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness clearly cannot be met with respect to claim 1, and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is defective and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Bell

Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 10-11-07
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 512/867-8458
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, via EFS-Web, on the date indicated below:

on

Date

October 12, 2007



Susan C. Lien